



## **5<sup>th</sup> MEXICO CITY Airport Consultative Committee (ACC)**

Consolidated Meeting Notes  
(Meeting date: June 15, 2017)

### **1. Airlines Only Session**

During the pre-meeting session the airlines community expressed their concerns of having clear timelines and milestones across NAICM stages, as this will help them to plan for input from subject matter experts and begin to address cost impacts. The attendees also expressed their concern about the lack of certainty in the start date of operations of the new airport, urging GACM in providing a more detailed Project Plan and more information about the BCG global strategy and business models analysis, as airlines need more details about fees, available leasing options and financial schemes/partnerships. It would be beneficial for GACM to kick off the working groups that were established to focus on specific areas.

Airlines need to understand how NAICM plans to deal with growth adjustments in line with forecast demand update as well as the plans to expand AICM capacity until the new airport opens. Other concerns expressed were the importance to get confirmation of the airlines allocation plan as discussed with GACM late in 2016, aircraft maintenance areas and update on number of gate parking positions vs remote positions.

### **2. Project Manager (PARSONS)**

Parsons presentation showed the civil works site status (preload of runways 2 and 3) and tenders progress. The PM pointed out runways 2 and 3 will be concluded at the end of 2018 and runways 6 in 2019.

PM Plan estimates that ORAT might take 8 months once NAICM is constructed (Jan 2021). In response, according to IATA's experience in airports of the same size of the future NAICM, ORAT planning should start at least 2 years before the planned airport opening date. As yet it is not clear how the development of the ORAT program will be addressed. Airlines expressed the need for more information and a more participative role in this process as this is critical for a smooth transition while switching from AICM to NAICM. Furthermore, the establishment of a clear concept of operations (Con Ops) is necessary before a meaningful ORAT can be planned for.

The attendees continued to express serious concerns about the lack of project Milestones. The aviation community has been asking for a comprehensive Project Schedule since the initiation of the project but so no such program has been provided by either GACM or Parsons as the Project Managers. This is a vital piece of information which has been missing from the project since its inception and the result is a lack of collaborative and timely input.

Attendees expressed the importance of having regular updates and timelines about the progress of NAICM. Many definitions and design /development decisions are still not being shared: infrastructure (kiosks, counters), IT systems and equipment of lounges, maintenance facilities/infrastructure and who will be responsible for building it. Those definitions are necessary

in order for the airlines to be prepared to make the necessary fit-out investments (i.e.: lounges, offices, etc.) and to align construction plans with NAICM if airlines are prone to build. Often the investment criteria need to be formulated for airline senior management approval and inclusion in corporate budgets 18 months in advance of approval to proceed.

Despite the Fuel Farm tender being placed in 2017/2018, airlines expressed concern about the lack of clarity of the scope of the tender. It remains unclear if construction of the fuel supply pipe line to NAICM is included in the scope as this is important to have reliable and cost efficient means for fuel supply. If this scope is not part of the pending tender the airlines are asking for clarity on how this issue is being addressed and where the responsibility for fuel supply pipeline lies.

### **3. General Review of Master Architect's Works (FOSTER)**

The Master Architect (MA) pointed out 100% of project design was already delivered, however, adjustments are being made. MA described the check in hall and kiosk design, flows to safety filters, waiting rooms and exit doors, general layout and GTC operation. Also MA confirmed the simultaneous boarding at boarding gates.

In regards to the check-in area, MA indicated that NAICM check in counter design (island) can be configured as per airline's requirements. For airlines it is important to have a detailed project plan in order to know when it will be necessary to start discussing the customization or their preferred operational areas. This requirement is again fundamental to having an agreed and endorsed airline check-in allocation plan and ensuring that the customized check-in (bag drop, etc.) facilities are available for ORAT trials.

The review of Baggage Claim area showed differentiated areas for passengers coming from South America, contrary to current agreements reached with authorities at AICM. The airline community requested that the NAICM design of this area be reviewed and modified to suit the new agreed streamlined functionality.

The airlines also expressed concern about the long walking distances for passengers moving from one side of the terminal to the other (~1.4 km). The airline community requests more detailed information about walking distance parameters, facilities (passenger conveyors to expedite passengers journey), and the level of services taken into account during the design. The overall airport terminal Minimum Connection Time (MCT) also comes into question with such extensive walking distances. A respectable MCT compared with other global airport hubs is needed in order for NAICM to achieve its objective of becoming a recognized global aviation hub airport.

Cooperation with the authorities is necessary to define regulatory changes, approved technology, and other facilities improvements (e.g. the implementation of an APM, use of biometrics, visa exemptions) to improve and exceed IATA's MCTs requirements (in the future those MCTs could decrease more) to minimize the impact of those for connecting passengers; consequently, the NAICM design has to be flexible enough to support this.

The airline community remains unclear about the design parameters that have been established by the consultants for the Baggage Handling System (in system times, baggage transfer / connection times, induction points and locations, early bag storage, etc.). Outcomes of agreed special BHS workshops have not been followed up and it is unclear what, if any, input from the workshops has been incorporated in the BHS design. The airlines also requested confirmation

of GACM's decision about implementation of curbside bag check / check-in facilities including the potential for connection with the BHS and other space and equipment requirements.

#### **4. General Review of Master Civil Engineer's Works**

TASANA described air side, runway/taxiway layouts, the land side jobs and traffic studies. The civil works in the area around Control Tower and the service infrastructure design for the Airport City zone were also explained.

Airline community representatives have requested more detail about the space constraints for GSE equipment maintenance areas as well as aircraft maintenance areas highlighted by the Master Planner. Also the attendees expressed concern about the capacity of the northern road surface security access (Control Post) to the midfield area which accommodates the Cargo Terminals, Maintenance Hangars, Catering Facilities, and other vital operational support facilities. The airline community believes that this access point is undersized given the expected traffic flow. It is vital that access to the Cargo area is maintained at a high level to support the proposed increase in overall Cargo volume expected to support airport operations in the future. The access point, as it is currently designed, will potentially create a significant bottleneck. The airlines are requesting a traffic flow study and transparency on the assumptions being used to size the Control Post facility. Similarly, the airlines pointed out that the proposed single access point to the midfield area represents a major operational risk for the in the event of either unintentional or intentional disruption. TASANA explained that necessary traffic studies are being carried out and necessary adjustments will be made to the design. The airlines request that these studies and the assumptions behind them are shared and discussed openly with the airline community. An Airfield Access workshop is recommended to address this important operational issue.

Also, in response to questions from airlines, GACM commented that the construction of the Satellite Terminal in Phase 1 is under review. However GACM representatives highlighted that a cost/benefit analysis would be required to justify the construction of the Satellite Terminal as part of Phase 1.

In addition, Aeroméxico asked for feedback on the concerns the airline has previously sent to GACM (3 May) regarding the location and number of rapid exit taxiways. To date no acknowledgment or feedback from GACM or the consultant has been forthcoming.

#### **5. Master Planner (Landrum & Brown)**

Landrum & Brown presented the results of the updated forecast study for aircraft operations and passengers demand. A comparison with the previous aviation forecast study on which the ARUP Master Plan was based indicates an increase of 24% (aircraft movements / passenger throughput) through 2030. Peak hours, arrival and departure patterns for Phase 1 were discussed and the Master Planner (MP) agreed to send more detail of the peak hour's analysis to IATA.

Aerodrome requirements and simulations of aircraft airside movements were explained as well as the use of runways, the connection between them and their allocation according to the type of flight operations. Due to the increase of commercial operations on Runway 6; the Master Planner recommends building an additional cross-field taxiway connecting Runways 3 and 6. Airline representatives noted that this would increase the amount of traffic crossing the runway system and consequently it will increase the risk of "runway incursions". As a possible solution

Aeromexico recommends extending the parallel taxiway system further south. Both parties agreed to have technical discussions about this issue in a separate meeting.

The revised Master Plan also recommends constructing Runway 1 as part of Phase 2 of the project instead of Runway 4. Airline representatives noted that the construction of the end-around taxiway for Runway 2 and the southern cross-field taxiways for Terminal 1 become a necessity when additional runways are built in Phase 2. The airlines emphasized the importance of analyzing in detail the phasing of these airfield improvements as they impact the hourly throughput capacity, the airline's operational cost, and the number of runway crossings, which in turn impact the overall capacity of the runway system.

The revised forecast also indicates that NAICM will be contact gate constrained almost from opening day. MP also highlighted that there will be a need to use remote aircraft boarding positions for all airlines, not only at peak hours but throughout the operational day. The revised forecast also shows that the Satellite for T1 will be needed by 2023. Airline community representatives expressed their concern to GACM and asked that GACM reconsider the provision of contact gates rather than the use of remote positions for boarding passengers. Contact gates enhance the passenger proposition and provide a differentiated product at NAICM given its future status as Mexico's hub airport. A deficiency of contact gates will also increase Minimum Connection Times across the entire airport campus thus negatively impacting NAICM's competitiveness in comparison with other hubs in the region.

Given the need for additional satellites earlier than originally indicated in the initial master plan, it is recommended that the necessary support infrastructure, including the APM tunnel that connects Terminal 1 with the future satellites be provided as part of Phase 1. This will minimize operational disruptions on the T1 apron during Phase 2 construction. The airline community stressed the importance of receiving GACM confirmation that these elements are being included as part of the Phase 1 development.

GACM explained that the recommendations derived from the revised forecast / Master Plan are being studied and the feasibility of incorporating them into the project and the packages that have already been tendered is being analyzed. GACM stated that, at the moment, the analysis related to the passenger terminal building infrastructure is being prioritized and all of these requirements will go through a design and financial analysis process to define how best to implement the recommendations.

MP determined that both the Departure and Arrivals kerb capacity is insufficient and will require adjustment to be able to handle the increased vehicle volume resulting from the revised forecast. Also, the capacity of the employee parking areas for Phase 1 was questioned.

Airline representatives also highlighted the need to review the site areas allocated for aircraft maintenance and ground support vehicle maintenance.

Regarding baggage handling system (BHS), MP indicated that BHS capacity is sufficient to cope with the demand till 2030. However with the available information provided (June 2016) it cannot be guaranteed that capacity (9,600 XQ / hr.) will cover future demand (15,159 passenger / hr. peak). The airline community requested a detailed analysis and the assumptions and performance criteria being used as the basis for determining the capacity of the BHS and EBS.

The updated forecast and master plan developed by Landrum and Brown have significant implications on the definition of the NAICM Phase 1 development. (Opening Day and Design Year). It is vital that the airline community participates actively in the discussions of how capacity enhancements recommended by the Master Planner are incorporated into Phase 1 plans. Enhancements include but are not necessarily limited to:

- A west parallel taxiway to Runway 6,
- An additional taxiway connecting Runway 3 and 6,
- A taxiway connector south of crossfield taxiways to Runway 3,
- Phasing of configuration of allocated check-in facilities and investments in equipment for check-in counters,
- Baggage system design and infrastructure,
- Additional infrastructure for international connecting passengers

The airline community must be involved in the decision-making process (“value engineering”) in close association with GACM and their consultant team. The outcome of this collaboration will be an agreement on the scope and capacity of Phase 1 infrastructure.

IATA asked GACM to follow up on the Baggage Handling System concerns and the recommendations made by the MP. Separate airline/GACM workshops, in the form of the BHS working group, is required to provide the necessary level of detail.

## **6. Cargo Terminal Master Planner (ALG)**

ALG provided information about the revised customs model, layout of cargo terminal, cargo inspection flow, import/export flow, warehouses/aircraft positions and dimensions, and possible changes in inspection processes.

In order to reduce traffic in the Cargo terminal area and maximize the use of the aprons, ALG explained the possibility of moving mail/packages warehouses out of the area currently designated for Cargo Terminal facilities and placing them to the west end next to Runway 1.

Airlines welcomed the new configuration of the Cargo Terminal shown by ALG considering a single combined cargo terminal for both International and Domestic cargo, and the customs processes control considered inside the terminal. Airline community warned that the number of freighter flights is restricted by the slots situation in AICM, but in the future without the slot restrictions, cargo operations might increase. It was also expressed that cargo operations would benefit if tail-to-tail connection infrastructure and process are implemented.

The attendees agreed that it is necessary to incorporate the inspection processes of other Authorities (SAGARA, PROFEPA, SENASICA) in addition to SAT in a single inspection area as part of the Cargo Terminal design. Also requested was that a commissary / bonded warehouse facility (consumables and equipment plus foreign alcohol) be considered within the tax area for the operation of the international airlines.

## **7. Airport City Master Planner (IDOM)**

This presentation showed the airport city location, dimensions and possible uses (logistics, aeronautical support, shopping centers, recreation, offices, parking lots and housing). GACM asked the consultant to reconsider the provision for residential land development, as this land use is generally incompatible with airport operations and would also significantly impact traffic volumes.

## 8. Connectivity Plan (SCT)

SCT presented the road extensions and expansion that are being considered to extend to NAICM and explained 18 mobility projects, all of them located in the periphery of NAICM.

Airlines questioned how these roads will behave at peak times, and what the average travel times for employees will be. Also attendees questioned the connectivity to the north employee access point, since all transportation modes are being planned to arrive at GTC (subway, taxis, buses). The airline community representatives expressed their concern about the lack of a clear surface access / mobility project to / from the CDMX, which contains the main flow of passengers and employees. Airlines urged GACM to review and enhance the plans of the CDMX government in terms of roads and mass transportation mobility at a metropolitan level.

IATA considers that road network is insufficient to handle the surface access requirements of the new airport. Currently there is only a single point of access and not all roads connect to it. Proposed changes to the public road infrastructure are based on expansions and connectivity within existing roads rather than any significant changes or upgrades to the overall road network in the airport region. The opportunity to take a strategic look at opportunities and seek new solutions to the overall traffic problems already manifest in the airport region have not yet been taken. The airline community expressed grave concern that simply modifying the existing airport surface access infrastructure would not adequately address the capacity requirements of the new airport. The opportunity to undertake a comprehensive metropolitan wide road access strategy has not occurred.

## 9. Additional points not discussed during the ACC meeting:

**Clarification on Airport IT System model and strategy is required.** It is a recurring requested topic that has not been covered, even though it was included in 4th ACC agenda but still is not being presented. For the Industry it is necessary to analyze the IT Master Plan in order to guarantee that their vision and requirements are considered in the IT platform/strategy envisaged for NAICM.

**Wildlife control program.** As a consequence of the lakes near the south of the runways the Airline community expressed its concerns about the control of wildlife and birds, as these can impact an engine or the fuselage during approaches and departures.

**Airspace Design.** There is an absence of airspace design, simulations and considerations for simultaneous operations on runways at maximum capacity as well as reviewing the plan for only one CAT III runway in one direction, as this could bring operational constraints with landing demand during peak hours and bad weather conditions. For the industry it is necessary to get more information about the progress on this topic.

**Studies of cul-de-sac operations** during push-back, taxiing procedures and aircraft movements are necessary to understand operational constraints, envisaged operational procedures for optimizing operations, and reduce aircraft movements.

**Airport operator.** Airlines consider that an early designation of an airport operator would significantly help to support the design process providing resolution for operational aspects of the project that will affect the overall efficiency of the airport (e.g. conops, overnight maintenance at

aircraft stands / contact gate) and eliminate the need for the design consultant team to make operational assumptions that will impact how NIACM operates in the future.

#### **10. Next Meeting**

GACM and the airline community agreed to hold the next MEX ACC (6th ACC) in November 2017. The exact date is to be proposed by GACM.